

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### **1. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103**

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diaz et al. (US 5812789 A) in view of Miyawaki et al. (US 5752266 A)

5 Response:

#### Claim 1

In the Office action dated 09/22/2008, Examiner stated that all claimed limitations recited in applicant's claim 1 were found unpatentable over Diaz in view of Miyawaki. The applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's point of view, and would like to  
10 point out that the teachings of Diaz and Miyawaki are mistakenly considered by Examiner. Rationale is given as below.

Applicant's claim 1 explicitly defines "a video signal processing system for encoding an encoding bit stream according to characteristics of a decoding bit stream" and "an encoder electrically connected to the storage device for encoding the encoding bit  
15 stream according to an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream". (*emphasis added*) Therefore, the claimed encoder refers to characteristics of a **decoding** bit stream to generate an **encoding** bit stream. In other words, the applicant teaches that characteristics of a decoding bit stream (i.e., an encoding scheme of a decoding bit stream) are involved in the generation of an encoding bit stream. However, upon careful review of teachings of  
20 Diaz, the applicant asserts that such a claimed feature is not taught by Diaz. As shown in Fig. 2 and stated in col. 1, lines 21-24, Diaz's disclosure is directed to **sharing a memory interface** between a video and/or audio decompression and/or compression device and another device contained in the electronic system. Besides, in view of Diaz's teachings directed to the decoder/encoder 45 shown in Fig. 2 (e.g., col. 6, line 28-col. 8, line 36), the  
25 applicant respectfully notes that **Diaz' disclosure is silent on any correlation between the video encoding and the video decoding, not to mention using an encoder (reference numeral 46 in Diaz Fig. 2) to encode an encoding bit stream according to characteristics (e.g., an encoding scheme) of a decoding bit stream to be decoded by a decoder (reference numeral 44 in Diaz Fig. 2).** The applicant therefore asserts that the  
30 claimed limitation "an encoder electrically connected to the storage device for encoding

the encoding bit stream according to an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream” is by no means disclosed by the teachings of Diaz. (*emphasis added*)

Regarding the cited Miyawaki reference, the applicant asserts that the above-identified feature recited in applicant’s claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Miyawaki. As stated in column 1, lines 11-12 and 61-64, Miyawaki’s disclosure is directed to a method of **controlling access to a memory** to improve the efficiency of a **memory system** without increasing the capacity of a buffer memory, the width of a memory bus, or the operating frequency. Specifically, Miyawaki teaches: “Namely, the priority of the refresh operation of the memory 4 and the writing and reading operations of different types of data to and from the memory 4 is changed according to the situation of the memory 4, and these operations are arbitrated and scheduled according to the changed priority. Consequently, the present invention realizes an efficient memory system without increasing the capacity of a buffer memory, the width of a memory bus, or the operating frequency (col. 5, lines 9-18)”. (*emphasis added*) Besides, upon careful review of Miyawaki’s disclosure, the applicant respectfully notes that the description pertinent to the video decoding operation is only found in col. 7, line 64-col. 8, line 1: “The video encoder 206 converts the digital image output of the image decoder 200 into video signals such as NTSC (National Television System Committee) or PAL (Phase Alternation by Line) video signals that are displayed on a standard television set”. (*emphasis added*) In view of above, **Miyawaki’s disclosure is also silent on any correlation between the video encoding and the video decoding, not to mention using an encoder to encode an encoding bit stream according to characteristics (e.g., an encoding scheme) of a decoding bit stream to be decoded by a decoder**. The applicant therefore asserts that the claimed limitation “an encoder electrically connected to the storage device for encoding the encoding bit stream according to an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream” is by no means disclosed by the teachings of Miyawaki. (*emphasis added*)

Briefly summarized, as neither Diaz nor Miyawaki teaches the claimed limitation “an encoder electrically connected to the storage device for encoding the encoding bit stream according to an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream” recited in applicant’s claim 1, the applicant therefore contends that claim 1 should be found allowable over

Diaz in view of Miyawaki.

Furthermore, as stated in the second paragraph at page 2 of the Office action dated 09/22/2008, Examiner acknowledged that Diaz does not specifically disclose the encoder encoding the encoding bit stream using one of the plurality of encoding schemes except the third encoding scheme when the encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream is the third encoding scheme. However, Examiner contended that this feature can be taught or suggested by Miyawaki. The applicant respectfully disagrees. In light of above arguments, Miyawaki fails to teach or suggest an encoder electrically connected to the storage device for encoding the encoding bit stream according to an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream. The applicant therefore believes that the claimed limitation “the encoder encoding the encoding bit stream using one of the plurality of encoding schemes except the third encoding scheme when the encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream is the third encoding scheme” is neither taught nor suggested by Miyawaki. (*emphasis added*)

In light of at least above reasons, the applicant contends that claim 1 should be found patentable over the cited prior art and placed in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and reconsideration of the patentability of applicant’s claim 1 is respectfully requested.

## Claims 2-9

As claim 1 includes claimed features patentable over the cited prior art and claims 2-9 are dependent upon claim 1, claims 2-9 having further limitations added to claim 1 therefore should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

## Claim 10

In the Office action dated 03/27/2008, Examiner stated that all the claimed limitations recited in applicant’s claim 10 were found unpatentable over Diaz in view of Miyawaki. The applicant respectfully disagrees and points out that the teachings of Diaz and Miyawaki are mistakenly considered by Examiner. Rationale is given as below.

Applicant’s claim 10 explicitly defines “video signal encoding and decoding method

for encoding an encoding bit stream according to characteristics of a decoding bit stream” and “(a) checking an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream to decide an encoding scheme for encoding the encoding bit stream”. (*emphasis added*) Therefore, the claimed method refers to characteristics of a **decoding** bit stream to generate an **encoding** bit stream. In other words, the applicant teaches that characteristics of a decoding bit stream (i.e., an encoding scheme of a decoding bit stream) are involved in the generation of an encoding bit stream. In view of above arguments of claim 1, the applicant therefore asserts that such claimed features are by no means taught or suggested by Diaz in view of Miyawaki.

10 Similarly, referring to above arguments of claim 1, the applicant also points out that the other claimed feature “(b) encoding the encoding bit stream using one of the plurality of encoding schemes except a third encoding scheme when the encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream is the third encoding scheme” would never be taught or suggested by Diaz in view of Miyawaki.

15 In light of at least above reasons, the applicant contends that claim 10 should be found patentable over the cited prior art and placed in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and reconsideration of the patentability of applicant’s claim 10 is respectfully requested.

20 Claims 11-25

As claim 10 includes claimed features patentable over the cited prior art and claims 11-25 are dependent upon claim 10, claims 11-25 having further limitations added to claim 10 therefore should be allowed if claim 10 is found allowable.

25 **2. Conclusion**

Based on the above remarks/arguments, the applicant respectfully submits that all of the rejections set forth in the Office action dated 09/22/2008 have been overcome and the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact  
30 the undersigned applicant’ representative at the number indicated below.

Appl. No. 10/711,139  
Amdt. dated January 22, 2009  
Reply to Office action of September 22, 2008

Sincerely yours,

/Winston Hsu/

Date: 01/22/2009

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526  
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.  
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562  
Facsimile: 806-498-6673  
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)